

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,720	05/29/2001	Olivier Vendier	Q64636	5944
7590 10/06/2003 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 800			EXAMINER	
			KIANNI, KAVEH C	
Washington, D		800	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2877	
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/865,720	VENDIER ET AL.
,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin C Kianni	2877
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the same of the	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of ti (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ci	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the pe	eriod set forth in f the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) _ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
$3. \square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would l canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: 9-12 and 14-22.		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 13.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	ر(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:	Supervisor	nk G. Fonê y Patent Examine: gy Center 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's arguments are directed to those that were already addressed by the examiner in the final rejection. However, the examiner notes that the new arguments presented in pages 8-11 by the applicant arguing that means plus for heat removing means has not shown by the examiner that removes heat rom said module via a first face of said module to the soleplate the examiner responds that the means plus function is channels/pipes that remove heat from the chip(s) to the soleplate 19 as stated by the examiner in the final rejection.

The examiner further recommends to the applicant that the claim language of the independent claims need to be further narrowed in order to make the case in an allowable condition.

٠